

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY
Washington, DC

MINUTES OF A REGULAR MEETING
OF THE FACULTY SENATE HELD ON
FEBRUARY 14, 1992, IN LISNER HALL
ROOM 603

The meeting was called to order by President Trachtenberg at 2:24 p.m.

Present: President Trachtenberg, Vice President French, Registrar Gaglione, Burdetsky, Carson, Divita, East, Felts, Garriis, Gilmore, Griffith, Gupta, Harrington, Hill, Keimowitz, Kenny, Maddox, Miller, Morgan, Parke, L. Robinson, Schiff, P. Smith, S. Smith, Smythe, and Vontress

Absent: Parliamentarian Schechter, Belknap, Friedenthal, Giordano, Holmes, Mahmood, Park, Pock, D. Robinson, Silber, and Wirtz

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes of the regular meeting of January 17, 1992, were approved as distributed.

OLD BUSINESS

A SUBSTITUTE RESOLUTION TO AMEND THE FACULTY CODE TO ESTABLISH SCHOOL-WIDE PERSONNEL COMMITTEES (91/6) (POSTPONED TO FEBRUARY 14, 1992, SENATE MEETING)

On behalf of the Appointment, Salary and Promotion Policies Committee, Professor Hill, Chair, distributed copies of Substitute Resolution 91/6, as amended by the ASPP Committee. In Paragraph 1.a. the words "whether compelling reasons exist" were deleted, and the words "as to whether it has identified any 'compelling reasons' which may exist" were added. Professor Hill said that the new wording suggests that school-wide personnel committees would not simply seek out compelling reasons, but would identify them for the dean. Professor Hill asked for unanimous consent of the Senate to accept this amendment. No objections were made, and the amendment to Substitute Resolution 91/6, Paragraph 1.a., was unanimously approved.

Professor Hill then moved that consideration of Substitute Resolution 91/6, as amended, be deferred to the March 13th meeting of the Senate, inasmuch as representatives of the Law Center were not present today because of a conflicting special faculty meeting.

The question was called on the motion to defer Substitute Resolution 91/6, as amended, to the March 13th Senate meeting, and the motion was approved. (Substitute Resolution 91/6, as amended,

is attached to Agenda of the March meeting).

INTRODUCTION OF RESOLUTIONS

No resolutions were introduced.

REPORT BY LOUIS H. KATZ, VICE PRESIDENT AND TREASURER, ON
UNIVERSITY'S PLANS FOR RENOVATING MARVIN CENTER AND BUILDING A
HEALTH AND WELLNESS CENTER AND COMMUNICATIONS BUILDING

Vice President Katz said that the purpose of this report was to try to put in context the planning process (institutional integration of academic, fiscal, and facility plans) that is going on at GW, in particular some facility projects that are in the discussion and planning stage, which will be presented to the Board of Trustees in March. Using slides and charts, he described the following University projects: (1) The Institutional Space Utilization Study (see Attachment A); (2) Classroom/Laboratory Upgrade Program (see Attachment B); and (3) Campus Development Projects, which include a joint project with WETA, Marvin Center Renovation, and Smith Center Renovation/Health & Wellness Center (see Attachment C). With regard to the fiscal planning process, Vice President Katz said that the administration was working on a five-year plan with 1993 being the first year of that plan which strives to effectively allocate resources to meet our institutional goals. He pointed out that in the present environment the University does not want to over-leverage itself, but there is adequate capacity to finance these projects if supported by incremental revenue streams. He said that these projects were chosen because they have identifiable funding sources, create a net gain in academic space approximating 110,000 sq. ft., can be completed in the near-term, and will support the University's goals, which is not to say, however, they have the highest priority. Vice President Katz then offered to answer questions.

In response to Vice President Katz' report, Professor Smythe, Chair of the Fiscal Planning and Budgeting Committee, said that the Committee has been discussing these issues since last fall. The Committee is very supportive of the administration's efforts to improve classrooms. With regard to the WETA project, it appears that there is no significant financial risk involved in this project, as presently conceived. With regard to the Marvin Center renovation, this would be an important step in making the campus more congenial. There are two levels under consideration--one, a more ambitious level and the other a scaled down version. All of the money for the scaled down version and most of the money for the ambitious version appear to be essentially at hand; however, the Committee will try to keep a close eye on the cost estimates. Professor Smythe noted that the Committee spent more time discussing the proposed Health & Wellness Center and it has two levels of concern regarding this project. The first is that, unlike the other two projects discussed here, this Center would be

financed by user fees. Mandatory fees of about \$200 per year would be imposed on full-time students. This raises the question of other possible uses of new revenues that might have a higher priority than the Health & Wellness Center. The second level of concern is that mandatory fees are proposed for part-time students as well as full-time students. The question came up whether it was reasonable to expect part-time students who would make little use of this facility to pay a mandatory fee for this kind of activity. Also there is an issue here about reduction of benefits for staff and faculty who now have free use of the Smith Center. What is proposed is a user fee of \$300/\$400 per year for staff and faculty, which is a lot more than "zero." The Committee was of the view there should be graduated user fees as it did not seem fair that lower-paid employees should pay the same fee as higher-paid employees. Another point for consideration is that the new facility would not include a swimming pool. Professor Smythe said that the Fiscal Planning and Budgeting Committee thought this project appeared to be a small risk but stressed there could be a shortfall of revenue if enrollments went down.

The floor was given to Professor Donald C. Paup, who spoke on behalf of the Athletics and Recreation Committee. He said that the Committee has been involved almost exclusively with the architectural designs and space utilization modifications in the structure of the Smith Center. The Committee has not been involved in any priorities or any of the fiscal responsibilities of the building.

Professor Smith, Co-Chair of the Joint Committee of Faculty and Students, pointed out that though private health club fees are higher than the suggested \$300 fee for faculty, in many cases faculty can use county and municipal facilities on a pay-for-use basis at a very modest cost. Thus, in addition to appearing to impose on faculty new user fees for racquetball and other activities that formerly were free, he said a concern of the Joint Committee is that this attempt to realize a key objective of enhancing the campus community may backfire, by driving faculty away from campus gym facilities, thereby potentially reducing faculty-student interaction.

Professor Griffith expressed his agreement with Professor Smythe that the WETA project and the renovation of the Marvin Center appear to be reasonable ideas, and added that he also joined in their serious concerns about the justifiability of the Health and Wellness Center project, on which he wished to elaborate briefly. He noted that in the past, the Faculty Senate had several times been assured that new building projects would not burden University operations, only to learn later that they would. The Virginia Campus building was a case in point. He questioned Vice President Katz's assurance that there would be "no diversion of academic resources" to build the Wellness Center because of the planned separate fees to be imposed on students and faculty to

support the project. In the current climate, when the University feels constrained to limit sharply increases in tuition for FY 1993, the addition of a \$100 per semester fee for a Recreation Center presumably replaces an equivalent tuition increase, or a designated fee which might go to other, more academically central purposes, such as supporting library or laboratory equipment acquisitions. In short, if the University is forecasting so little additional income next year that it is only projecting a 2% average salary increase for faculty in FY 1993, it made him skeptical whether this project really was so essential that it should go forward. His own review of the case for it, in terms of "student demand" and expressed student willingness to pay a special fee, suggested the argument for it was not strong enough to justify this capital expenditure at the present time. In closing, Professor Griffith noted that building an exercise center which competed with commercial gymnasiums might make it harder to defend the University from the D.C. Mayor's proposed tax on our property. He urged the Fiscal Planning and Budgeting Committee to continue to monitor these plans and advise the Senate as to its recommendations.

Vice President Katz responded that the primary purpose of the Health & Wellness Center would be to serve GW's students, faculty and staff and that it would not be a commercial enterprise.

President Trachtenberg said that he thought the projects were a good idea but they would have to be thoroughly examined. The Senate's advice is not only welcomed but indeed solicited. Before going forward with any of these buildings, he said that the Senate ought to get further briefings. Since we are entering a new era, however, he did not think the University should lose its courage and forward motion, but should also not go "a bridge too far."

At this point, the President left the meeting, having turned the Chair over to Vice President French.

Further discussion followed by Vice President Katz, Professors Gupta, Garris, Hill, Harrington, Morgan, Griffith and Lilien Robinson.

Vice President French thanked Vice President Katz for his presentation. Vice President Katz then introduced the new Associate Vice President for Finance, John A. Schauss, and the new Associate Vice President for Business, V. Scott Cole.

REPORT OF COATES/COHEN/GARRIS ON ACADEMIC PRODUCTIVITY AND TEACHING LOADS, TOGETHER WITH TASK FORCE REPORT

Professor Garris said that this report was prompted by Senate Resolution 89/9 regarding the relationship between faculty teaching loads and faculty research productivity. The President asked Associate Vice President Coates and himself to undertake a study

of teaching loads University-wide, to analyze the current level of teaching loads at GW in relation to professorial duties, in general, finally to suggest a plan for adjusting teaching loads which would utilize faculty effort in a way beneficial for the University. Professor Garriss said that he and Vice President Coates enlisted Peggye Cohen, Assistant Vice President for Institutional Research, to assist them in this assignment.

Professor Garriss then presented a brief outline of the report. He said the University is moving toward a meritocratic system of allocating resources. Historically, there has been a strong tendency of the University to distribute resources uniformly across the board rather than reward those faculty who excel. For this reason, it was very difficult to talk about teaching loads without getting involved in everything that faculty do. It was felt that research should be encouraged, but teaching should also be rewarded. Teaching load reductions for research faculty is not a reward--it simply recognizes that research takes time. In order to move toward a meritocratic system, a crude productivity model was developed as reflected in the C/C/G Report. Professor Garriss stressed that this model is weak in that they did not have the money to include publications and books, and it is based only on the 1989-90 academic year in which some departments may have had a bad or good year. He said, however, that in time this model could serve as a good tool for measuring productivity and teaching loads, but requires much more work. Professor Garriss then offered to answer any questions.

Vice President French noted that in order not to lose the valuable work of the Coates/Cohen/Garriss study, the Council of Deans has proposed between now and April a trial project involving seven departments. The chairs of these seven departments would be asked to act as an Advisory Committee in helping to test the C/C/G model for accuracy in measuring faculty workloads. Vice President French said he was delighted with this proposal and was inviting the Executive Committee to name two faculty members to assist in this project.

Professor Gupta pointed out that non-sponsored research was not included in the model. Vice President French replied that the improved version of the model would include non-sponsored research.

SPECIAL REPORT OF THE RESEARCH COMMITTEE ON THE PRESIDENT'S RESPONSE TO THE SPECIAL REPORT OF THE RESEARCH COMMITTEE ENTITLED "RESEARCH AT GW"

On behalf of the Research Committee, Professor Harrington, Chair, said that the Special Report basically supports the C/C/G Report and was distributed for informational purposes only.

Vice President French noted that, in response to the President's proposal of a 4-credit course, Professor Griffith and

he have discussed this proposal, and Jay R. Shotel, Special Assistant to the President, has been selected to chair this committee, along with two faculty members to be nominated by the Executive Committee. He said this committee will be asked to look at pedagogical and practical implications for teaching loads, and to report back in the fall.

GENERAL BUSINESS

I. REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

On behalf of the Executive Committee, Professor Griffith reported on the following items:

(1) On Wednesday, February 12, the Faculty Assembly approved the Senate's recommendation for modifying the Faculty Organization Plan to accommodate the merger of the College and Graduate School of Arts and Sciences. Also, the Executive Committee would like to express its appreciation to Professor Peter P. Hill, Chair of the Appointment, Salary and Promotion Policies Committee, and Vice President Walter M. Bortz for their skillful organization of the information session afterward on whether or not "cashability of TIAA/CREF retirement assets" should be recommended for adoption as University policy.

(2) In the light of the upcoming "open season" for changing health insurance coverage, the Executive Committee expects to have for the March agenda a report (possibly with a resolution) from the Appointment, Salary and Promotion Policies Committee on a recommendation from the President's Benefits Review Committee that the University's contribution to health insurance and to retirement plans be linked in the future. It is possible that a general information session similar to the one on cashability may be offered in early March.

(3) The Executive Committee also anticipates for the March meeting of the Senate a report from the Special Committee on the Virginia Campus Planning, chaired by Professor Robert W. Rycroft.

(4) The Executive Committee reports to the Senate that it has established a committee to review the principles which currently govern elected representation and terms of office in the Senate and to advise whether any changes are indicated. The Committee will be chaired by Professor Roger E. Schechter, Senate Parliamentarian, and includes Professor Martha N. Rashid, Professor Susan B. Tolchin, and Emeritus Professor Roderic H. Davison, Advisor.

(5) The Executive Committee is currently engaged in establishing two joint Senate/Administration Task Forces: one, as called for in Senate Resolution 91/4, to study ways to improve the flow of information within the University community; the second,

to study the President's request to consider switching to a thirty-two course undergraduate curriculum structure.

(6) Committee Service forms for volunteering service on Senate and Administrative Committees were distributed with the agenda for this meeting. It would be very helpful if members of the Senate took the time to indicate their own preferences, as well as encouraging colleagues to volunteer service for appropriate committees. We will also be asking later for the help of chairs of standing committees in evaluating the service of members of their committees.

(7) The Executive Committee reminds Chairs of Standing Committees which have been proposed for restructuring as joint Senate/Administration Committees next year -- Research, Physical Facilities, and Fiscal Planning and Budgeting -- that before the incoming and outgoing Executive Committees meet to staff the committees in April, it will need their guidance as to the appropriate structures for those committees.

(8) The meeting of the Executive Committee to set the agenda for the March 13th Senate meeting will be held on Friday, February 28th. Please advise the Executive Committee as soon as you know that you will be bringing forward items for its consideration at that meeting.

(9) A reminder: the Honors Convocation will be held at 2:00 p.m., February 15th, in the Marvin Center Ballroom and the Winter Convocation will take place at 12:00 noon, February 16th, in the Smith Center.

II. INTERIM REPORTS OF SENATE COMMITTEE CHAIRS

On behalf of the Committee on Honors and Academic Convocations, Professor Maddox, Chair, reported that the Committee traditionally has had the responsibility of getting commencement speakers and honorary degree recipients for all of the schools until this year when it was informed that there would be a unified commencement involving all but two of the schools. The Medical School and the Law School were excluded simply because their commencements take place on other dates. The Committee discussed arguments for and against a unified commencement. The major objection to a unified commencement was the feeling that it increased the anonymity of the occasion, not just for the individual schools, but also for the individual students who would tend to be swallowed up in one large mass. There were two major reasons given for supporting a unified commencement. One, which had the unanimous endorsement of the student members of the Committee, was that a large, very visible commencement in the nation's capital was likely to draw a nationally or internationally-known commencement speaker. The other reason was that everyone has always found it awkward when the President has

to leave the podium to skip from one school's commencement to another one. Professor Maddox said that the Committee chose to send forward nominations for honorary degree recipients who are involved in the unified commencement, and it made every effort to assure that the fields of all the schools were represented by them. Nominees for the Medical School and the Law School have also been forwarded by the Committee to the President and the Trustees.

Professor Hill, Chair of the Appointment, Salary and Promotion Policies Committee, reported that the Committee has concluded from the discussion of cashability at the recent Faculty Assembly that legal questions still have to be resolved before a decision can be made. (See attached report -- Attachment D)

BRIEF STATEMENT (AND QUESTIONS)

Professor Gupta said he would like to highlight one of the comments made by Professors Harrington and Berman in connection with the Faculty Senate Research Committee Special Report regarding the replacement of part-time instructors with excellent graduate teaching assistants who "not only would be present on campus to hold office hours...but also would contribute substantially...to their departments' research productivity and intellectual atmosphere in general." Professor Gupta noted that the Mathematics Department has, for years, asked for an increase in the GTA "slots" assigned to its department. This has been of no avail. The department would very much like to be able to use its part-time teaching funds to help support additional full-time GTA's. The only impediment seems to be the unavailability of tuition credits. He noted that President Trachtenberg stated here last year that an addition of a few graduate students to ongoing graduate classes would not add significant costs to the University. The benefits to the University would be tremendous. This is especially true in the sciences and mathematics. Professor Gupta urged the administration to grant the departments additional tuition credits to enable them to support additional GTA's from their part-time budgets.

Vice President French replied that he was in the process of preparing a memorandum to increase funding for graduate students next year and it now becomes a question of each school's priorities for the utilization of rather remarkably expanded budgets for graduate students in the next academic year.

ADJOURNMENT

Upon motion made and seconded, Vice President French adjourned the meeting at 4:40 p.m.

A handwritten signature in black ink, reading "J. Matthew Gaglione". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large, stylized initial "J" and "M".

J. Matthew Gaglione
Secretary

ATTACHMENT A: SPACE UTILIZATION / ALLOCATION STUDY

WHAT IS IT?

A study of the use of existing facilities on- and off- the Foggy Bottom campus in an effort to enhance the current campus plan.

WHEN IS IT HAPPENING?

- o A Request for Proposal has been let to six firms who have demonstrated experience in this area.**
- o The study is anticipated to be complete within six months.**

WHAT ARE THE GOALS?

- o To better understand existing use patterns**
- o To identify areas of under- and over-utilization**
- o To suggest space allocations for research and office space**
- o To assess the University's space usage relative to national standards**
- o To develop strategies for reallocating existing space and for reducing off-campus rental expense**
- o To provide a planning tool to facilitate the development of a long-range campus plan.**

ATTACHMENT B:
CLASSROOM/LABORATORY IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

- o Program to systematically upgrade the classrooms throughout campus over the next 5 years.**

Improvements will include:

- lighting**
 - electrical**
 - carpeting**
 - furniture**
 - space reconfiguration**
 - technology enhancements**
- o Program began in FY 1991**
 - Improvement of 4 classrooms in Stuart Hall**
 - \$50,000 budget**
- o FY 1992 Plan**
 - Improvement of 39 classrooms**
 - \$505,000 budget**
- o FY 1993 Plan**
 - \$1,000,000 proposed budget**

ATTACHMENT C: DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS

- o Three projects have been identified that:**
 - will support the Institutional goals**
 - can be completed in the near-term**
 - have identifiable funding sources**

These include:

- Enhancement of the Marvin Center**
 - Improved On-Campus Health & Wellness/Recreation Facility**
 - Development of a building for GW/WETA joint programming**
- o Projects will benefit the entire University community and will improve GW'S marketability.**
- o Projects will NOT require the diversion of any academic resources.**
- o Project Planning is in preliminary stage.**

MARVIN CENTER RENOVATION PROJECT

WHAT IS IT?

A PRE-DEVELOPMENT PROJECT to review the required renovation needs of the Marvin Center.

WHO WILL BENEFIT?

STUDENTS

- o MORE student lounge space**
- o PROGRAMMED LOUNGE SPACE designed for specific student constituencies (e.g., undergraduate, graduate, commuter)**
- o IMPROVED food service offerings**
- o CENTRALIZED student services**
- o BETTER student meeting space**
- o GREATER accessibility for handicapped students**
- o MORE ATTRACTIVE building.**

FACULTY & STAFF

- o MORE and BETTER DESIGNED meeting space**
- o IMPROVED non-Board food service offerings**
- o BETTER lounge space**

HOW WILL IT BE FUNDED?

- o Restricted Reserves for sole use in Marvin Center**
- o Marvin Center Student Fee**

HEALTH & WELLNESS CENTER/ SMITH CENTER RENOVATION

WHAT IS IT?

A PRE-DEVELOPMENT Project to review required renovation of Smith Center and to analyze University additional Health & Wellness needs.

WHERE IS IT LOCATED?

Corner of 23rd & G Street

WHO WILL BENEFIT?

STUDENTS/FACULTY/STAFF

- o IMPROVED community/activity space**
- o ENHANCED Student Health Facility**
- o EXPANDED HIGH QUALITY recreation spaces**
- o OPPORTUNITY for creation of Sports Medicine/Cardiac Rehab Complex**
- o IDENTIFIED meeting/gathering space**

UNIVERSITY IMAGE

- o IMPROVED campus entry**
- o ENHANCED marketability**

HOW WILL IT BE FUNDED?

- o Project will be self-sustaining from membership revenues and student fees**

GW/WETA PROJECT

WHAT IS IT?

A FEASIBILITY STUDY to study the joint venture construction of new building to house National Center for Communication Studies, shared auditorium/meeting space and WETA broadcast studios, offices, and related technical space.

WHERE IS IT LOCATED?

Corner of 21st and H Street.

WHO WILL BENEFIT?

STUDENTS

- o **ENRICHED National Center for Communication Studies**
- o **STRENGTHENED LINK to the Community/Communications Industry**

FACULTY/STAFF

- o **IMPROVED ACCESS to WETA staff and constituencies**
- o **ENRICHED National Center for Communications Studies**
- o **ENHANCED Meeting and Audio-visual opportunities**
- o **STRENGTHENED LINK to the Community/Communications Industry**

HOW WILL IT BE FUNDED?

- o **Project will be developed on GW land that will continue to be owned by GW.**
- o **Debt and Equity sources from both GW and WETA.**

ATTACHMENT D

February 25, 1992

To: The Faculty Senate of the George Washington University

Fr: The Senate Committee on Appointment, Salary, and Promotion Policies

Committee Report and Recommendation on the "Cashability" of TIAA/CREF Accumulations

Universities have recently acquired the option of determining whether they will allow their employees (at the time they terminate employment) to cash out their TIAA/CREF accumulations or, as is now the case, to use those accumulations for annuity purposes. Whether the GW Administration should be urged to make this option available to its own employees has been under discussion for several months. These discussions have transpired in the Senate Committee on Appointment, Salary, and Promotion Policies, in the Benefits Review Committee and, most recently, at a meeting following the February meeting of the Faculty Assembly.

In light of the legal uncertainties that appear to attend the "cashability" of TIAA/CREF accumulations, the Committee urges the Faculty Senate make no recommendation to the Administration at this time. In support of this position, the Committee notes that, pending the outcome of a Supreme Court case currently on the Court's spring docket, uncertainty remains as to whether retirement funds which are made accessible to their beneficiaries may not also be accessible to litigants in cases of bankruptcy, malpractice, or personal liability actions. Until some or all of such uncertainties are resolved, the Committee urges that no recommendation go forward at this time.

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY
Washington, D.C.

The Faculty Senate

February 3, 1992

The Faculty Senate will meet on Friday, February 14, 1992, at 2:10 p.m., in Lisner Hall 603.

AGENDA

1. Call to order
2. Approval of the minutes of the regular meeting of January 17, 1992
3. Old Business:

A SUBSTITUTE RESOLUTION TO AMEND THE FACULTY CODE TO ESTABLISH SCHOOL-WIDE PERSONNEL COMMITTEES (91/6) (postponed to February 14, 1992, Senate meeting); Professor Peter P. Hill, Chair, Committee on Appointment, Salary and Promotion Policies (including Fringe Benefits) (Substitute Resolution 91/6 is attached.)
4. Introduction of Resolutions
5. Report by Louis H. Katz, Vice President and Treasurer, on University's plans for renovating Marvin Center and building a Wellness and Recreation Center and Communications Building, with responses by Fiscal Planning and Budgeting Committee, Physical Facilities Committee, and Athletics and Recreation Committee
6. Report of Coates/Cohen/Garris on Academic Productivity and Teaching Loads, together with Task Force Report; Professor Charles A. Garris (these Reports were previously distributed only to Senate members because of length.)
7. Special Report of the Research Committee on the President's response to the Special Report of the Research Committee entitled "Research at GW: Constraints and Incentives"; Professor Robert J. Harrington, Chair, Research Committee (Special Report of Research Committee is attached.)

(continued)

8. General Business:

(a) Report of the Executive Committee: Professor
William B. Griffith, Chair

(b) Interim Reports of Senate Committee Chairs

9. Brief Statements (and Questions)

10. Adjournment

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "J. Matthew Gaglione". The signature is written in dark ink and is positioned to the right of the "Adjournment" item.

J. Matthew Gaglione
Secretary

A SUBSTITUTE RESOLUTION

~~A~~-RESOLUTION TO AMEND THE FACULTY CODE TO ESTABLISH SCHOOL-WIDE PERSONNEL COMMITTEES (91/6)

WHEREAS, all academic units of the University are required by the Faculty Code (Art. IV-B and C) to publish their criteria for the tenure and promotion of regular full-time faculty; and

WHEREAS, school-wide personnel committees have served to assure uniformity in the application of these criteria in those schools where such committees have been established; and

WHEREAS, all faculty have a professional interest in the maintenance of high and uniform standards for tenure and promotion throughout the University; NOW, THEREFORE
BE IT RESOLVED BY THE FACULTY SENATE OF THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

- (1) THAT a new Section D be added to Article IV of the Faculty Code to read:

"D. School-Wide Personnel Committees

To implement the procedures required in Sections B.3 and C.2 above, each school or college shall establish a school-wide personnel committee, either as an elected standing committee or of the school faculty acting as a committee of the whole, to consider recommendations for ~~or against the reappointment,~~ promotion, or tenure of regular full-time faculty. Such committees may request additional information, documentation, or clarification respecting such recommendations. Further:

1. a. An elected standing committee, sitting in review of recommendations originating from a department or equivalent unit, shall advise the dean of that school or college as to whether the candidate has met the relevant school and department criteria, and whether 'compelling reasons' exist for not following the faculty recommendation. Such advisories shall not be construed as 'faculty recommendations' as defined by Sec. B.3. of the Procedures for Implementation of the Faculty Code.

~~b.---Such-elected-standing-committees-may-also review-departmental-criteria-for-reappointment,-promotion,-and-tenure,-and,-as-deemed-appropriate,-recommend that-such-criteria-be-clarified-or-specified-more-fully.~~

2. When the faculty of a school or college, sitting as a committee of the whole, serves as the school's personnel committee, and initiates recommendations to the

(continued)

Substitute Resolution 91/6 (cont'd)

dean for ~~reappointment~~, promotion, or tenure, such recommendations shall be construed as 'faculty recommendations' in the sense of Procedures, Sec. B.3."

- (2) THAT Section D. of Article IV, "Nondiscrimination," be restyled "E. Nondiscrimination."

The foregoing substitute resolution was approved by the Committee on Appointment, Salary and Promotion Policies (on 13 January 1992)

Postponed January 17, 1992, to the next regular meeting of the Faculty Senate, February 14, 1992

MEMORANDUM

January 31, 1992

TO: Members of the Faculty Senate

FROM: Robert J. Harrington, Chair
Senate Committee on Research

RJH

RE: Special Report: Memorandum to President Trachtenberg
Responding to his Comments on Research Committee's Special
Report: "Research at GW"

The attached memorandum was prepared by the former and the incumbent chairs of the Senate Research Committee. After discussion and amending the draft, the Research Committee approved the memorandum and sent it forward as a committee response.

It is hereby forwarded to the Faculty Senate as a Special Report, for information purposes only.

To: President Stephen Joel Trachtenberg

From: Barry L. Berman and Robert J. Harrington, on behalf of the past and present Faculty Senate Research Committees

Subject: Faculty Senate Research Committee Special Report

Date: January, 1992

We thank you for your thoughtful comments on the Special Report of the Faculty Senate Research Committee, "Research at GW: Constraints and Incentives," and for your concrete suggestions regarding our most important recommendation, on teaching-load reductions. It is gratifying to the committee members—who worked hard throughout the year to gather, to analyze, to summarize, and not least to think about the data, and finally to present the results together with our recommendations—to know that you treated the issues raised in the report as seriously as we did. This memorandum attempts to respond to your comments and suggestions, and also to suggest the next steps that we can take together to move forward on the key issue of research at GW—the central concern governing the creativity, productivity, and scholarship of the University community. In addition, we make some suggestions here that, although not addressed specifically in your memorandum, attempt to put into perspective some of the other recommendations that we made in our report.

General Comments

First, however, we would like to make a few general comments. One is that it can be misleading to compare GW with the leading research universities in the United States. At the Stanfords, Harvards, and Berkeleys, the pendulum between the research and teaching functions of the institution has swung very far to the research side, for many good and some not-so-good historical reasons, which we need not go into here. For this present imbalance these institutions are taking a lot of flak and some justifiable criticism in the media and elsewhere, as amply demonstrated by the wealth of newspaper clippings you so generously provide us with. But at GW, not only has the pendulum not swung over to the research side, it has never gotten anywhere near to center. We must struggle to redress our own imbalance, but ours is the opposite of the one receiving all the publicity at present. This makes our job difficult, because of the present perceptions of the public in general and of our students in particular (it is clear, for example, that *The Hatchet* is aptly named). But it is not impossible; if we make intelligent choices and put into effect prudent and cost-effective practices, our students, their parents, and even the public in general will appreciate the enhanced quality of the total educational experience offered at GW. [We offer an example of the educational value of research here. In the Physics Department, for each of the last five summers, several students, both graduate and undergraduate, participated in nuclear-physics experiments at the Los Alamos National Laboratory as part of an international team of researchers in which GW faculty played a leading role. These students (and their parents and friends) know that their education was enhanced by research at GW. Other research-oriented educational opportunities like this one exist at present at GW; but there could be, and should be, many more of them.] And, in spite

of all the recent university-bashing, it is still true (see, for example, the most recent issue of U.S. News & World Report on the subject) that there is a strong correlation between the research stature of a university and its desirability for undergraduate enrollment.

A second general comment refers to the response rate to our questionnaires. We were, and are, somewhat dismayed by the response rate from Department Chairs and Program Heads. For the three simple questionnaires we sent them, we got back 44, 30, and 27 out of 76—an average response rate of 44%. We regard this as a low response rate; we think that the Chairs should be more concerned than they appear to be with research issues. The response rate from the Faculty, to a much more detailed and time-consuming questionnaire, was 228 out of 666 (34%) for all schools except SMHS and 211 out of 412 (51%) for the Medical Faculty—an average response rate of 41% for all Faculty combined. We were, and are, delighted with this response; we regard this response rate as an exceedingly high one, and we conclude from it alone that at GW a large number, maybe even a majority, of the faculty are now or wish to become active researchers. Considering the fact that a research culture has not historically been in place at GW, we are greatly encouraged by this quantitative evidence that the efforts of the GW Administration along these lines for the last few years (as documented in our report), piecemeal as they were, have not been in vain. We also are convinced by this response that additional incentives for research and scholarship at GW would result in a large return on the amount invested.

Our third general comment is that one should not confuse the information and opinions supplied by the Administration (Section I of our report), the Faculty (Section II), or the Chairs (Section III) with our own recommendations (Section IV). Examples are the perceptions of some faculty that very little has been done by the Administration since the "Obstacles to Research" report of 1985 to encourage research at GW, and the comments by some chairs that teaching-load reductions should go to research-active faculty alone. We have tried to be as fair and objective as we could (considering our strong views on the subject) in our own recommendations. Our recommendations are mostly matters of degree rather than of kind—we know that over the last few years the GW Administration has made real progress in its support of research and scholarship, but we know as well that much more is needed. We are working in common to spur on the good efforts of your Administration, and to help as much as we can, both by making sensible and concrete suggestions and by helping, where we can, to implement them.

Teaching-Load Reductions

We now turn to the question of teaching-load reductions, which you correctly recognize as the "principal issue that looms over all the others." Of course, solving this problem entirely by hiring new faculty is very expensive, but this is not what we recommend in our report. We recommend, primarily, reallocation of currently existing teaching-load reductions to research-active faculty for purposes of doing more and better research. The Coates-Cohen-Garris Report makes it clear that a great deal can be done along these lines. We quote several excerpts here:

"...we...present several areas where current University resources, at no cost to the University and without hiring new faculty, can be more effectively utilized to provide course releases for appropriate faculty."—p. 20

"...for the ten most research-active departments, the amount of research accomplished equals the equivalent of about 2 courses per academic year yet, for these same departments the average course release for research is less than 0.5 courses per academic year. This is a major disincentive for research; a necessary impetus to developing faculty scholarship could be obtained by relating research productivity and the allocation of course releases."—p. 19

"...many departments presently do give extensive amounts of course release..., but allocations for research related work appears to be generally treated with lower priority than administrative tasks, some of which should perhaps be distributed among the faculty without course release."—p. 22

"Course releases should be given to faculty extensively involved in either sponsored or non-sponsored research, especially with involvement of graduate student teaching and research, based on their teaching and research productivity..."—p. 25

As for the negative aspects of the widespread use of part-time faculty, we agree with you that we must take special care not to adversely affect "GW's reputation for good teaching." We think that the best way to replace part-timers is with excellent graduate teaching assistants, proficient both in their own fields and in English, who not only would be present on campus to hold office hours, answer questions, and in other ways interact with and inspire undergraduates, but also would contribute substantially (in the course of their doctoral work) to their departments' research productivity and intellectual atmosphere in general. We also submit that supporting these excellent graduate students often implies no loss in tuition revenue to GW—if they were not given assistantships, they simply would not come to GW in the first place—and this being the case, their cost to the University is comparable to the cost of part-timers. Our second major recommendation, after teaching-load reductions for active researchers, is to increase substantially the number and size of support packages for graduate students, particularly in research-active departments. We think that there are very good grounds, based on research considerations alone, for this recommendation. When taken together with the expected improvement in undergraduate teaching, we think the case for this recommendation is compelling.

You point out how difficult and delicate it is to decide just who is "research-active." We have given a great deal of thought to this subject, and we conclude that the Department Chairs and Program Heads will have to play the pivotal role in this decision-making process; they are, or ought to be, the best qualified and appropriate persons to determine which members of their departments or programs are research-active. In addition, there could be, and undoubtedly should be input from a faculty member's colleagues, from his or her peers from other institutions, and, not least, from the individual in question. Use could be made of letters from reviewers external to the University who have an established reputation in the field of the individual, of general Departmental reviews by external scholars, of objective criteria defined by faculty members or representative faculty members in the

field, and of the individual's own documentation of his or her research activities, e.g., as presently contained in one's Annual Report or in proposals for research grants from the University Facilitating Fund. We think that in most cases, the situation will be clear, but we recognize that there will be a fair number of arguable cases, and that objective professional judgment will be necessary. This is why it is so important to have in place highly qualified Chairs, who recognize the importance of both good scholarship and good teaching, and the very strong links between them. We must be confident that Chairs place significant value on research activity and reinforce that value in tangible ways through their administrative prerogatives. Find a department with both a good teaching record and a strong research program and you will find a highly qualified Chair. This is the rationale behind another of our major recommendations, on the education of Chairs. You will be relieved to see that we agree that you are not the one to decide!

One more word on this subject. We believe strongly in the great value of good teaching. Research activity is not antithetical to good teaching; often they go hand-in-hand. And very good teachers who do not do research, or very much research, also should be rewarded—but usually not by reducing their teaching loads. We do not view a heavy teaching load as a punishment, but a research-active professor cannot do justice to both teaching and research with such a heavy load. For each individual faculty member, as throughout the entire University, a balance is necessary.

Other Recommendations

We do not want our other major recommendations to become overshadowed by all of the above. There should be more institutional incentives at GW for initiating and expanding research; we suffer at present from too many disincentives. A significant fraction of indirect costs from research grants should be returned to researchers and research administrators for research purposes, as is done at almost every research university; such funds work directly to produce more and better research, and thus eventually to increase incoming grant funds. The Office of Sponsored Research should take more of the administrative burden of research activities off of the shoulders of the researchers—paying professors to do clerical work is poor economy. More seed funds—relatively small sums, but highly effective—should be provided, particularly for young or new faculty. More and better research space, perhaps at the Virginia Campus, would make possible more and better research, and would very likely facilitate increased grant funding. More money for matching equipment grants would be very effective in leveraging much larger sums for badly needed research equipment. [Here again we point to the Physics Department for recent examples: computation equipment in the \$100K range for which GW contributed one-third of the cost, and nuclear detection equipment in the \$200K range for which GW is contributing one-fifth of the cost. In both cases, GW's contribution was instrumental in obtaining the grants.] We note as well here that laboratories and equipment, unlike more volatile "soft" research funding, for personnel and travel only, lend a degree of permanence and continuity to research programs, from which GW could benefit greatly. More (but still modest) support should be provided to a limited number of centers of research excellence at GW; these funds also can be leveraged effectively to increase external grants by GW researchers having proven track records. And finally, the Medical School has its particular

needs, primary among which is to redefine the "research-professor" designation, which (peculiarly in medical research) has negative connotations, in order to facilitate more external funding of research programs.

Changing the Curriculum Structure

There remains to address your proposal for a wide-ranging revamping of the entire undergraduate curriculum structure from a 40-course, 3-credit/course format to a 32-course, 4-credit/course one. This proposal obviously has important implications far beyond its effect on the research activities of the faculty, and clearly needs to be examined very carefully by all segments of the University community.

We thank you again for your careful and sympathetic attention to the needs of the GW research community. We hope that our comments and suggestions help you to continue the transformation of GW into a University in the complete sense of the word, where the research culture and its concomitant rationality are alive and well, and where teaching and scholarship can flourish together, each enhancing the other, for the mutual benefit of the producer and the consumer of knowledge, of the professor and the student. We are ready, through the members of this year's Research Committee, to continue the work of their predecessors and to move ahead in partnership with you to achieve these goals.